

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-23 are rejected.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 5, 10-12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland in view of ZENG. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/016058). As to claim 1, the Office Action states that Copeland is silent in disclosing that the modulated entities are incompatible with the video content. However, the Office Action relies upon Zeng as teaching embedding modulated entities which are incompatible with the content in an image.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for distorting a recording of projected images and recites the steps of imposing modulated entities on video content of video source materials, the modulated entities being incompatible with the video content; demodulating the modulated entities, wherein the demodulated entities are compatible with the video content; and projecting the video content to provide the projected images. As can be seen, the modulated entities provide a distortion with respect to the desired video content and demodulating the modulated entities renders the entities compatible with the video content for projection. In the present amendment, the demodulating step has been amended to recite “wherein the demodulated entities are compatible with the video content” to more precisely describe the effects of demodulating step. The amendment adds clarification, and, for the reasons below, is not considered necessary to distinguish the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination Copeland and Zeng fails to teach the steps of claim 1. Zeng is directed to the field of digital water marking. According to Zeng, there are two requirements for watermarking. First, watermarks “should not interfere with the media

being protected,” and second the watermark should be sufficiently robust to defeat any attempt to eliminate the watermark or to fake a watermark to establish a counterfeit ownership claim. See par. 3. Thus, Zeng teaches a method for embedding a watermark that is a “visually imperceptible indicia.” See column 3, par. 0030. In other words, unlike the modulated entities of the invention of claim 1 which are incompatible with the video content, the watermarks of the Zeng reference must be compatible with the video content. According to Zeng, they are visually imperceptible. The modulated entities of claim 1, however, are intended to distort the video content rendering it undesirable to watch. For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Copeland in view Zeng. Likewise, claims 5, 10-12 and 23 are patentable for their dependency from claim 1.

The Office Action further rejected claims 2-4 and 6-9 and as unpatentable over Copeland in view of Zeng as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Graf. These claims are also patentable over the cited references for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1.

Claims 13 through 22 stand rejected over Copeland and Zeng in view of Guido. Independent claim 13 is directed to video source material for a projection system, the source material comprising modulated entities incompatible with a video content of the video source material and selectively deliverable modulation information. The projection system demodulates the modulated entities according to the modulation information wherein the demodulated entities are compatible with the video content, the projection system also introducing a recording device dependent interference. Independent claim 17 is directed to a system for distorting a recording of projected images, this system including a modulator responsive to video source material, the modulator imposing a recording device dependent interference on projected images and a

demodulator for demodulating modulated entities wherein the demodulated entities are compatible with the content of the video source material.

For the reasons stated above, the combination of Copeland and Zeng fails to teach modulated entities being incompatible with a content of the video source material and demodulated entities being compatible with the video source material. Zeng, relied upon in the Office Action for this limitation, merely introduces a perceptually invisible watermark which is compatible with the video content. Unlike the claimed inventions of claims 13 and 17, in which modulated entities are incompatible with the video content, demodulation renders the modulated entities compatible with the video content. The remaining rejected claims all depend either from claim 13 or claim 17 and are allowable for the reasons set forth above.

II. Summary


Having fully addressed the Examiner's objections and rejections, it is believed that in view of the preceding remarks, this entire application stands in a condition for allowance. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, he is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at the number and address below in order that any outstanding issues may be resolved without the necessity of issuing a further Action. An early and favorable response is earnestly solicited.

Please address all future correspondence to Intellectual Property Docket Administrator, Gibbons, Del Deo, Dolan, Griffinger & Vecchione, One Riverfront Plaza, Newark, NJ 07102-5496. Telephone calls should be made to Vincent E. McGeary at (973) 596-4837 or (973) 596-4500.

III. Fees

If any additional fees are due in respect to this amendment, please also charge them to
Deposit Account No. 03-3839.

Respectfully submitted,



Vincent E. McGeary
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,862

Date: November 30, 2005

Gibbons, Del Deo, Dolan, Griffinger & Vecchione
One Riverfront Plaza
Newark, NJ 07102-5496